

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of the remarks set forth below. Claims 1-7, 9-17 and 19-27 remain in the application. Claims 1-7, 9-17, and 19-27 remain unchanged. Claims 28 and 29 are new.

**Objections to Claims**

In the Office communication dated June 21, 2005, claims 7 and 20 are objected to. However, the communication does not provide any further information as to the reasons for the objection. Applicants respectfully request further information so that the objections can be addressed.

**35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-6, 9-17, 19 and 21-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hicks, in view of Takase.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "identifying active display elements and non-active display elements on the display unit . . . monitoring an aging of the active display elements . . . detecting when the display unit is turned off . . . determining if the display is going to remain off for an extended time period . . . and displaying a corrective image on the identified non-active display elements if it is determined that the display is going to be off for an extended period of time."

As noted in the Office Action date June 21, 2005, Hicks fails to teach all of the elements of this claim.

Takase appears to teach a system and method for a CRT having a power saving mode that turns off the CRT based on a predetermined set of conditions and after a predetermined lapse of time (col. 3 lines 25-30). More specifically, Takase appears to present a system that determines whether the CRT is on or has been "forced on" (col. 8 lines 34-38). Next, the system determines if the unit is placed in power save mode (col. 9 lines 5-10). If the unit is placed in power save mode then a timer is employed to measure the time that no video is present on the display (col. 9 lines 46-50). When this timer exceeds its time limit a power circuit is turned off (col. 9 line 36-41). The timer is re-initialized (col. 8 lines 27-33) or reset by one of the followed conditions: a "forced on" condition occurs, power save mode not activated, or if video is detected (col. 9 lines 55-60).

As a result, Takase appears to teach determining if a period of time has elapsed during which no video has been displayed, and the video display unit has remained on. The step of determining is done by starting a timer when the display unit is on and when video is no longer displayed. If the timer completes its time period without any change in the conditions, then the display unit is turned off. Takase does not describe that "determining" involves determining if the display unit will remain on for an extended period of time. It simply employs the timer to keep track of elapsed time in order to determine whether to turn the display unit off. This is further illustrated by Takase in Figure 4 and described in the specification (col. 10 line 28 to col. 11 line 23).

In contrast, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "determining if the unit is going remain off for an extended time period . . . and displaying a corrective image . . . if it is determined that the display is going to remain off for an extended time period." As discussed in applicants' application, the step of determining involves either a manual scheduling mode or an automatic scheduling mode. These modes are described on page 8 line 5 to page 10 line 25 and also in Figures 5 and 6. Applicants respectfully suggest that simply waiting a period of time, as taught in Takase, is not the same as determining if a display will remain either on or off. Therefore, Takase, nor Hicks, nor the combination of the two teaches the "determining if the display is going to remain off for an extended period of time" element of claim 1. As a result, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Dependent claims 2-6, 9-16, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 1, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations that they contain. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection of claims 2-6 and 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Independent claim 17 includes elements similar to the elements of independent claim 1 and should therefore be allowable for the same reasons discussed above as well as for the additional recitations contained therein. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Dependent claims 19 and 21-27, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 17, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional

recitations that they contain. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection of claims 19 and 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome in accordance with the above remarks and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.


Claims 28 and 29 have been added as dependent claims to claims 17 and claim 1 respectively. Support for these claims is found on page 10 lines 2 and 3 of the application.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' agent at (317) 587-4027, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No additional fee is believed due in regard to the present amendment. However, if an additional fee is due, please charge the fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Grimes et al.



By: Michael A. Pugel, Agent

Registration No. 57,368

317-587-4027

Thomson Licensing Inc.  
Patent Operation  
Two Independence Way, PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

October 13, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

OCT 13, 2005

date

Michael A. Pugel

Michael A. Pugel